	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/766,740	JACKAM ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	BRIAN MCCAIG	1797
Participants: Status of Application: <u>RESPONSE TO NON-FINAL</u> <u>OFFICE ACTION ENTERED AND FORWARDED TO EXAMINER</u>		
(1) <u>BRIAN MCCAIG</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>RYAN CARTER</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: <u>4 August 2010</u>	Time:	
Type of Interview: ☑ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applic	ant's representative)	
Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No If Yes, provide a brief description: .		
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: 103		
Claims discussed: 122, 198, 225		
Prior art documents discussed: van Loon and Kenneally et al		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENE See Continuation Sheet	ERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate 	ne examiner will provide a written record of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summa	ry by the examiner appears in F	'art II above.
BAM 8/11/2010		
	Applicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Claim 77 appears to be in condition for allowance with the limitation precluding water washing. Claim 122 is improper since it depends on claim 95, which has been cancelled. If the limitation precluding the water washing were incorporated into claims 198 and 225, the application may be in condition for allowance (and if claim 122 is amended as well)..